

COMMUNICATIONS.

WRENTHAM ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

WRENTHAM, August 24, 1838.
 My dear Sir,
 The following resolutions were adopted at a meeting of the Wrentham Anti-Slavery Society, held at the Centre meeting-house on the first inst. Will you please to give them an early insertion in the Liberator?
 Yours truly,
 WM. HARLOW.

Resolved, That the progress of emancipation in the West Indies, and the liberty which is this day proclaimed to the colored people, furnishes occasion of gratitude and thanksgiving to God.
 Resolved, That the abolition of slavery in the British West Indies, demonstrates the practicability and expediency of immediate emancipation in this country.
 Resolved, That for the rapid advancement of the progress of liberty, and the cheering prospect we now have of the speedy termination of slavery in this country, we are indebted, under God, to those who have labored and acted upon the principles of immediate emancipation.

Resolved, That we view with regret the influence of slavery as a stumbling block to the right of petition, suppression of the press, obstructing the general diffusion of intelligence, and menacing the citizens of the nation with being hung should they dare to utter words of truth, and we feel bound, as we value the rights of ourselves and posterity, to resist these encroachments on our rights, by renewing our petitions to Congress to abolish slavery in the slaveholding territories and islands, and the slave-trade between the same.

Resolved, That John Quincy Adams is worthy the respect and gratitude of his fellow-citizens, for his arduous and persevering exertions in the cause of humanity.

Resolved, That slavery, being a violation of the principles contained in the declaration of our national independence, and in opposition to the precepts and spirit of the gospel, cannot under any circumstances be justifiable, and ought to be immediately abolished.
 Resolved, That slavery is a violation of the laws of God, and a hindrance to the success of the gospel, especially among the heathen, inasmuch as rational beings are thereby held and treated as property and degraded from the mass of mental and moral improvement, and the rights of husband and wife, parent and child, are thereby broken up; and whereas, in some countries, ministers, church-officers and church-members, have been concerned in and identified with this system, corrupt and dangerous system, we believe that the cause of truth, justice, humanity and religion would be greatly promoted, if non-slaveholding churches would have no fellowship with slaveholding churches and members of churches, and come out from among them and be separate.

Resolved, That the preceding resolutions be presented by our delegates before the Norfolk County A. S. S. Convention, to be convened at Medway, on the 15th inst., for their consideration, with the request that the above or a similar resolution may be by them adopted.
 Resolved, That the resolutions adopted at this meeting be at the disposal of the press.

A POPE FROM GROTON.

At a meeting of the male and female Anti-Slavery Society of Groton, held this evening, July 30th, it was unanimously resolved—

1. That by the blessing of Almighty God upon the cause of anti-slavery, its progress has exceeded the expectations of its warmest friends, and that the Rev. Dr. Johnson, already reeling under the weight of moral debt cast upon him by the friends of humanity, and throughout the civilized world.
 2. That while we rejoice in the signs of the times, it is the duty of the friends of the slave to guard themselves from the excess of joy, and to persevere through evil reports, in the use of all appropriate means to rid our beloved country of its foulest and most oppressive curse.
 3. That we congratulate our anti-slavery friends in Groton for their successful efforts in the cause of humanity in that kingdom, and that to the untiring and distinguished ability of that devoted champion of human rights, GEORGE THOMSON, is much of our success to be attributed.

4. That the appropriate field for the labors of George Thomson is believed now to be the United States of America, and that we should hail his arrival in this country as an event calculated to give a mighty impulse to the cause of freedom—and that it would be peculiarly gratifying to see him once more in this place, where he first pleaded the cause of the slave against a world of sinners.
 5. That the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, be requested in behalf of the abolitionists of the U. S. States, forthwith to invite to our aid, and to our warmest advocates, GEORGE THOMSON, and his able coadjutor, CHARLES STUART.
 6. That the above resolutions be published in the Liberator.

FIRST OF AUGUST IN BOSTON.

The colored people of this city held a meeting on the 1st of August, at the Baptist church, Belknap-street, in commemoration of the final emancipation of their brethren in the West Indies. The house was full to overflowing, and a lively interest was manifested by the audience. All felt that the claims of humanity had been vindicated, and that the first of August would bring down upon the heads of the slaveholders a deluge of fire and brimstone. The Rev. Mr. Burley was appointed President of the Temperance Festival, and Mr. S. C. Carter, Vice President. The hospitality with which Mr. W. Lewis received us seemed to add a new zest to the pleasures of his table. Meats, nicely dressed vegetables, and fruit were abundant; hilarity and joy reigned in the hearts of all present. Cold water and lemonade were the only drinks made up of us.

At three o'clock, a large number of colored gentlemen, headed by Mr. Burley, proceeded to the Temperance Festival, to partake of a dinner, which I am informed was served up in T. S. T. style. The day passed off, apparently, without disturbance of any kind. We remained strangers visiting the city to the house of Mr. W. Lewis. He is a host whose easy manners cannot fail to strike every one agreeably, and his house is a very pleasant situation.
 T. C.

AS MUCH OPPOSED TO SLAVERY AS YOU ARE.

Mr. Zetser—Permit me to inquire, through the medium of your paper, how far the members of an orthodox church and society, as much opposed to slavery as you are, can consistently oppose the loaning of their money to support an anti-slavery address on the subject of July, from such considerations as the following:
 1. That the minister is opposed to the measures of the slaveholders.
 2. That the introduction of anti-slavery into the pulpit would cause division and break up the church and society, although it professes to be founded upon the Rock of Ages, and its members pretend to be 'as much opposed to slavery as you are.'
 3. That the object of the abolitionists in applying for the meeting-house was, to break up the society to re-form another, although the fact in the case was, that neither member of the committee of application was from either church referred to, and it was not known to any member of the society, alleged to be re-organized, that the application was to be made, until after it had been presented.
 4. I would propose another query—Has any man or body of men, a moral right to break a legal contract, provided they are willing to pay damages?
 CONSISTENCY.

BOSTON.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 10, 1838.

OLIVER JOHNSON, EDITOR PRO TEM.

THE NEW YORK OBSERVER.

We published, a short time since, a caustic paragraph from the Pennsylvania Freeman, in which allusion was made, in terms of just indignation, to a charge brought against the Liberator, in 1833, by the Vermont Chronicle, of having denounced Washington as a robber and a man-stealer. The present editor of the N. Y. Observer, who was the conductor of the Chronicle at the time referred to, and the author of the article in which the charge was brought, has published a statement of the affair, which appears to demand some notice at our hands.
 He first accuses friend Whittier and ourselves of injustice towards the present editor of the Chronicle in neglecting to state that the article in question was not penned by him but by his brother. Whether this complaint on the part of the Observer originated more in genuine compassion for his brother of the Chronicle, at seeing attributed to him an act of such superlative meanness, than from his own excessive desire to take all the glory of it to himself, we shall not pretend to decide; although his habitual self-conceit and insensibility to shame, as well as his attempted defence of the act, would naturally lead us to attribute it to the latter. However this may be, we think friend Whittier ought to have stated the case as to place the responsibility where it belonged. Nevertheless, on this point, we will let him speak for himself, premising only, by way of confession, that redactions similar to those which led him to commit the original offence, induced us to publish his paragraph without an explanatory note. Friend Whittier, in reply to the charge of injustice, above alluded to, says:

The present editor of the Vermont Chronicle is a brother of Joseph Tracy, editor of the New York Observer, of which the Chronicle is the mere echo. He has always been in Joseph's leading strings—a tail to his brother's kite—following him as closely as the shadow follows the substance. Whether edited by the really talented, acute and hair-splitting Joseph, or his most dutiful brother, the Vermont Chronicle has always been the same, carping and jesuitical—a moral grimaldi, moving almost great principles and noble efforts of benevolence, and the utterances of philanthropy—quibbling, word-catching, and reminding one of Dr. Wolcott's magpie.

A bird for curiosity well known,
 Who, with head airy, and curious eye,
 Peeps knowingly into a marrow bone.

We spoke of the Vermont Chronicle as the originator of the slander against the abolitionists—and it is of little consequence which Tracy it was who actually penned the article of which we complain.

The statement of friend Whittier respecting the Chronicle was in the following words:

For ourselves, we cannot help remembering that a paper called the Vermont Chronicle, first started the charge, and that the present editor of the Liberator had denounced George Washington as a robber and man-stealer.

To this the editor of the Observer, who was the author of the charge referred to, replies as follows:

The article in question did not specify the editor of the Liberator, as here intimated. It spoke of the doctrines of Anti-Slavery writers, and as an illustration, quoted from a correspondent of the Liberator.

It did not assert or insinuate, that the correspondent of the Liberator, or any body else, had singled out George Washington, and denounced him by name as 'robber and man-stealer.' This, the present editor of the Liberator very well knows, and we are surprised that Mr. Whittier does not know it. The story, that the Chronicle had brought such a charge, is merely one of William Goodell's fabrications.

The Chronicle did assert, that according to the doctrine of the correspondent of the Liberator, and other Anti-Slavery writers, every slaveholder is a robber and man-stealer, and of course George Washington was one. This assertion,—that such was their doctrine,—is true. No Anti-Slavery writer has ever dared to deny it. Oliver Johnson, who then, as now, edited the Liberator in Mr. Garrison's absence, did not deny it. William Goodell, who endeavored to convict the Chronicle of slander, by charging upon it language which it had not used, did not deny it, but on the contrary, endeavored to entrap the Chronicle into an admission of its correctness. John G. Whittier will not deny it, for he knows it is true.

Now all this looks very plausible, but it is nothing more nor less than a system of that duplicity and jesuitical cunning for which its author is so notorious. We give him credit for more skill in the art of deception than Miss Ope ever dreamed of; but in this instance he has entangled himself in a web, from which he will find it difficult to escape.
 'The article in question did not specify the editor of the Liberator.' It only 'quoted from a correspondent of the Liberator.' From this the editor could doubtless have inferred, (though he dared not utter the falsehood in terms,) that he did specify 'a correspondent.' He specified 'the Liberator,' without saying whether he quoted from the editor or a correspondent, but in such a connection as he well knew would lead every one to attribute the language to the former. This was one of those tricks which no one knows so well as to how to practice successfully as himself, and to which a man of any other quality would soon resort.

Again: the Observer says, that 'it [the Chronicle] did not assert or insinuate, that the correspondent of the Liberator, or any body else, had singled out George Washington, and denounced him by name.' It is on, by asserted, 'that according to the doctrine of the correspondent of the Liberator and other anti-slavery writers, every slaveholder is a robber and man-stealer, and of course George Washington was one.' Now we affirm that this is untrue. The Chronicle did not say, as the Observer would fain make the public believe, that the delineation which it gave of Washington's character was drawn by way of inference from 'the doctrine of anti-slavery writers.' It was very careful to keep that fact concealed, while the article was so skillfully arranged as to produce the impression on the mind of nearly all its readers, that the delineation, in the precise shape in which it was presented, was copied from the Liberator. We cannot make the matter plain in any other way than by copying the article in question just as it appeared in the Chronicle. This will afford every one the means of deciding whether its author has told the truth respecting it, fairly and honestly, or whether he has been guilty of perversion and deception. The following is the article.

From the Vermont Chronicle of June, 1833.

CHARACTER OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Commander in Chief of the American Army during the Revolutionary War, and the first President of the United States.

Scarcely any man, in modern days, has stood higher in the estimation of the whole civilized world, than George Washington. As a patriot, a sincere, enlightened, and unselfish friend of freedom and the rights of man; as a man of the strictest integrity, as a sincere and a devoted Christian, he has been held up to the gaze of an admiring world, and seldom, if ever, has a voice been raised to question his claim to this high honor. But it seems that all this is a delusion—the very reverse of truth. The honor of this discovery is due to the advocates of the New England Anti-Slavery Society, whose delineation of his true character we proceed to copy.

1. He was a hypocrite.
 Call the slaveholder by what good name you please, his profession of religion is insulting hypocrisy.—Liberator.

2. As to his honesty, he was a thief.
 His religion and Christianity are insufficient to actuate his obedience to the eighth commandment,—thou shalt not steal.—Id.

3. He was a kidnapper.
 For he is a man thief, a sinner of the first rank, and guilty of the highest kind of theft, who is condemned to death by the law of Moses.—Id.

4. He was habitually guilty of perjury.
 Every man-stealer, who takes the oath of office in the United States, commits willful and corrupt perjury; and during the whole period of his continuance in office, he is living with the guilt of habitual false swearing attached to him.—Id.

5. He is not in hell.
 Any man who repents, with all other workers of iniquity, will have his part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.—No man-stealer can enter the kingdom of heaven.—Id.

At least such was the doom for which his general character prepared him, and there is no evidence that

he escaped it, even by a death bed repentance; for he lived and died a slaveholder.

This description of the true character of Washington is in four-six lines in the fourth and fifth column of the second page of the Liberator of May 18th. By more extensive, and yet not laborious search, we might prove, by testimony equally conclusive, that he was a robber, (Prof. E. Wright,) that he was a 'tyrant,' (Mr. Garrison, *passim*;) and that he deserved many other appropriate names. We hope, however, that men will learn to be consistent in this subject, and will believe the Liberator and its partisans, speak of Washington accordingly.

Mark the head of the article. It is—Character of Washington—not of slaveholders in general. It is no presented as an application of anti-slavery doctrine to a particular case, but the DELINEATION ITSELF is declared, in so many words, to be that of 'the advocates of the New England Anti-Slavery Society.' Mark, too, the declaration which immediately follows the delineation.—'This description of the true character [not of slaveholders in general, but] of Washington, is found in four-six lines in the Liberator.' From this, every person unacquainted with the facts would naturally suppose that Washington had been singled out by name, and the specific charges all applied directly to him. With this understanding, the article was copied greedily into the vilest political papers, and as friend Whittier truly says, it has, 'up to the present hour, been one of the most powerful incentives to mob violence' against abolitionists. We heard it bandied from mouth to mouth among the drunken wretches who fired 'Pennsylvania Hall,' as an apology for their conduct; and we are free to confess that we consider them innocent in comparison with the originator of the slander. Friend Whittier has stated in their proper light, the circumstances in which the article was put forth. He says:

Some time in the fifth mo., 1833, about one year after the organization of the New England Anti-Slavery Society, and when the principles and views of abolitionists were little understood, a correspondent of the Liberator spoke in terms of strong indignation of the advertisement of one Lewis A. Collier, a human-flesh dealer, of Richmond, Va. The writer had been informed that the said Collier was the proprietor of this detestable seller of his fellow-beings; and his remarks were consequently severe and denunciatory. Not one word was said of George Washington, or any individual, except the infamous Lewis A. Collier. Upon this article the editor of the Vermont Chronicle seized with avidity,—not to oppose the horrors and atrocities of the domestic slave-trade, but to speak out in tones of manly indignation against a system so cruel, so abhorrent to the benevolence of God. He thought of the prosperity of the partial family—the wife torn from her husband and her children, and the slave prison of Richmond—the slave ship floating along with her cargo of despair; he did not follow the victims of wrong and cupidity to the slave-marts of New Orleans—to the rice swamps of the Carolinas, and the cotton fields of the great Valley. Oh no. The editor of the Vermont Chronicle was no 'fanatic.' His business was the abolition of the Anti-Slavery Society, not of Southern Slavery. He could tolerate Lewis A. Collier, the Richmond land-pirate, better than William Lloyd Garrison, the editor of the Liberator. He saw, as he supposed, an opportunity to make the friends of Emancipation odious in the eyes of the community. By practising a little pious fraud, his language applied to the Richmond land-bribe and his kindred slaveholders, could be turned against the almost idolized Washington.

The Observer challenges us to declare our opinion of Washington. We will answer the challenge next week.

REV. E. S. GANNETT IN ENGLAND. It is known to a portion of our readers, that the Rev. Mr. Gannett, of Boston, the colleague of Dr. Channing, was recently in England. At the anniversary of the Peace Society, which was held in the Friends' meeting-house, Houndsditch, on the 22nd of June, he was invited to make a speech, and was introduced to the audience as a delegate from the American Peace Society. The moderator, on taking the seat, alluded to him in the following terms:

An American gentleman was present, and he trusted that he would lay some stress upon the methods adopted by ministers here to promote the principles of peace. He thought they needed a little instruction upon that point. But while America inculcated the principles of peace, let her also inculcate the principle of freedom, and all the giving of liberty to the slave. (Loud cheers.) In this way they might reciprocate good offices. (Applause.)

To this Mr. Gannett, in his speech, responded as follows:

There was one topic to which, from the remarks made by the Chairman, in introducing the business, he felt it necessary to advert. There were, he acknowledged, dark spots on America. Slavery still existed in the United States, to the shame and grief of Christian hearts. He came, however, from the north, where he had spent the whole of his days, and he could assure the meeting that he did not know a single mind in New England which did not regard slavery as the curse and the blot of their institutions. (Hear, hear.) Still, however, he was bound in justice to his country to say, that he was a questioner of such political speculations, of such extreme difficulty in political aspects—however simple might be its moral aspect—that they ought to be judged with candor. If British generosity could not go further, it ought to be careful how it attributed blame, which it remembered that slavery was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not planted in the free, independent United States, but in British colonies. (Hear, hear.) By the existing Constitution of the United States, Congress was absolutely precluded from meddling with the subject of slavery in the United States. He believed that the slave was not

LITERARY.

ORIGINAL ODE.

Sung at Marlboro' Chapel, August 1, 1838.

Loud Hosannas,
Wave your banners,
Sound the trumpet of Jubilee!
Thousands springing
Forth are singing
Sweet is Freedom—WE ARE FREE!

From the mountain,
Vale and fountain,
From each shady grove and dell,
List! arising,
Joy surprising,
Which shall Britain's glory swell.

Oh the glory
Of the story,
Freemen, hail the blissful morning,
See ye not the heavenly dawning,
Tyrants quiver,
Shadows shiver,
Freedom's triumph hath begun!

Glorious hour,
Which the power,
Of the arm, O Lord, hath given,
Soon shall wake
Those forsaken,
Whom spirits still are given.

Holy Father, speed the day,
Hold thee on thy conquering way,
Then from grateful hearts shall rise,
Hallelujahs to the skies!

We'll praise Thee, we'll praise Thee,
Thou glorious conquering One!
We'll praise Thee, we'll praise Thee,
Thou glorious conquering One!

Hosanna! Hosanna! Hosanna!

GOD.

BY DEBRAHAN.

O Thou Eternal One! whose presence bright
All space doth occupy—all motion guide—
Unchanged through time's all devastating flight—
Thou only God! There is no God beside!

Being above all beings! Mighty One!
Whom none can comprehend and none explore;
Who fill'st existence with thyself alone;
Embracing all, supporting, ruling o'er—
Being whom we call God—know no more!

In its sublime research, philosophy
May measure out the ocean deep—may count
The sands, or the sun's rays—but God! for thee
There is no weight nor measure; none can mount
Up to thy mysteries. Reason's brightest spark,
Though kindled by thy light, in vain would try
To trace thy counsels infinite and dark;
And thought is lost ere thought can soar so high,
Even like past moments, in eternity.

Thou from primeval nothingness didst call,
First chaos, then existence; Lord, on thee
Eternity had its foundation: all
Sprung from thee; of light, joy, harmony,
Sole origin; all life, all beauty thine,
Thy word created all, and doth create;

Thy splendor fills all space with glory divine;
Thou art, and work, and shall be glorious! Great
Life-giving, life-sustaining, Potentate!
Thy chains 'th' unnumbered Universe surround,
Upheld by thee, by thee inspired with breath!

Thou the beginning with the end hast bound,
And beautifully mingled life and death!
As sparks mount upward from the fiery blaze,
So suns are born, so worlds spring forth from thee,
And, as the spangles in the sunny rays,
Shine round the silver snow; the pageantry
Of heaven's bright arm glitters in thy praise.

A million torches, lighted by thy hand,
Unwearied wander through the blue abyss;
They own thy power, accomplish thy command,
All gay with life and eloquent with bliss.
What shall we call them? Piles of crystal light?
A glorious company of golden streams?
Lamps of celestial ether, turning bright?
Suns, lighting system with their joyous beams?
But thou to these art as the moon to night.

Yes! as a drop of water in the sea,
This insignificant world is lost;
What are ten thousand worlds, compared to thee!
And what am I, then? Heaven's unnumbered host,
Though multiplied by myriads, and arrayed
In all the glory of sublimest thought,
Is but an atom in the balance weighed
Against thy greatness—'tis a cypher, brought
Against infinity! What am I, then? Naught.

Naught!—but the effulgence of thy light divine,
Pervading worlds, hath reached my bosom too.
Yes! in my spirit doth thy spirit shine,
As shines the sunbeam in a drop of dew,
Naught!—but I live, and on hope's pinion fly
Eager toward thy presence; for in thee
I live, and breathe, and dwell; inspiring light,
Even to the throne of thy Divinity,
I am, O God! and surely Thou must be!

Thou art! directing, guiding all, Thou art!
Direct my understanding, then, to thee;
Control my spirit, guide my wandering heart;
Though but an atom, 'midst immensity,
Still, I am something fashioned by thy hand!
I hold a middle rank 'twixt heaven and earth,
On the last verge of mortal being stand,
Close on the realms where angels have their birth,
Just on the boundaries of the spirit land!

The chain of being is complete in me;
In me is matter's last grand deed;
And the next step is spirit—Deity!
I can command the lightning, and am dust!
A monarch and a slave, a worm, a god!
Whence came I here, and how? so marvelously
Constructed and conceived! unknown? This cloud
Lives surely through some higher energy,
For from himself alone it could not be.

Creator! Yes! Thy wisdom and thy word
Created me! Thou source of life and good!
Thou Spirit of my spirit, and my Lord!
Thy light, thy love, in thy bright plenitude,
Filled me with an immortal soul to spring
O'er the abyss of death, and bade it wear
The garment of eternal day, and wing
Its heavenly flight beyond this little sphere,
Even to its source—to Thee—its Author there.

LINES.

From the German of Lanier.

Thought after thought, ye thronging rise,
Like spring-doves from the startled wood,
Bearing like your own sacrifice
Of music unto God!

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Friend of Man.

COLONIZATION AND POLITICS! EXPULSION AND HENRY CLAY.—The Emancipator gives us the information which follows:
On Monday last, the Rev. Mr. Proudfit, the Secretary and General Agent of the New York Colonization Society, was returning towards this city in the stage. In conversation with some abolitionists on board, he mentioned several things which he considered as imparting peculiar brightness to the prospects of the colonization cause at the present time. One was that he had learned at Washington city, by repeated conversation with the great men of the nation, among whom he named Mr. Clay, Mr. Whittier, of Ohio, and others. The Doctor said, in substance, 'In about two years, we shall have Mr. Clay chosen President of the United States, and he will then employ the resources of the nation in the removal of the blacks, just as they have been employed in the removal of the Indians.'

A crowd of reflections force themselves upon us, on reading this important intelligence.
1. The true spirit of colonization is here exhibited, under the sanction of Dr. Proudfit, and Henry Clay. The President of the American, and the Secretary of the New York Colonization Societies, ought to know what it is. And what do they make it? The same spirit that drove away 'the Indians' with a forced consent, equivalent to coercive expulsion! The spirit against which JEREMIAH EVARTS contended to his dying hour. The spirit which every consistent lover of his country continues to deplore.

2. Abolitionists are exhorted to refrain from political action its inconsistent with the character of a Christian and a minister. But here is the Rev. Dr. Proudfit exulting in the prospect of political action for the cruel expulsion of two and a half millions of native Americans. The president of the Colonization Society must be made president of the United States, in order to secure this iniquitous legislation! And doctors of divinity (forgetting their own warnings against itinerant evangelists and agents) must traverse the country, and preach up this wicked 'political crusade' in the pulpits, on the Sabbath, and whenever they can collect congregations.

3. We are told that Congress has no power over the slavery of the Southern States, and president Wayland would brand it as a dishonest act to abolish slavery, without southern consent, even in the District of Columbia, where, he confesses, we have the legal and constitutional power of so doing! But here we find Dr. Proudfit, agent of the Colonization Society, on behalf of Henry Clay, asserting, in the broadest terms, the power of Congress over the whole subject of slavery in the South—nay, more, the power of banishing as well as emancipating the cultivators of southern soil! This goes beyond Alvan Stewart's constitutional argument, just as much as the power of liberating and banishing goes beyond the power of simple liberation!

4. We have in this announcement, an unexpected solution of an enigma which has long puzzled us. We have been astonished to find one instance after another in which clerical gentlemen, exerting a strong influence against the political action of abolitionists, on the ground that Christians must not 'dabble in the dirty waters of politics'—were, nevertheless, in the midst of their pious horror of political contamination, discovered to be excessively anxious for the political elevation of HENRY CLAY! This was a riddle we could not comprehend. But the veil of masonic secrecy is at length penetrated. Henry Clay is the presidential candidate of the colonizationists, and the 'political action' of abolitionists is not likely to be exerted in his favor—Hence, finally.

5. Henry Clay cannot be President of the United States. His slaveholding, and his proslavery course in Congress, were sufficient to exclude him. But his advocacy of the infamous project of expelling one sixth part of the American people from their own country, puts the matter beyond further question. Dr. Proudfit may as well give it up first as last. His colonization candidate cannot have the vote of the empire State, and that settles the matter.

From the Christian Witness.

LETTER FROM GOVERNOR RITNER.
HARRISBURG, April 25, 1838.

Sir,—The letter which you, as Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Western Division of the Anti-Slavery Society of Pennsylvania, addressed to me on the 27th ult. was received on the 3d inst. By direction of the Society you ask me the following questions:
1. 'Is the existence of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, in conformity to the principles of justice and humanity, and according with the genius and theory of our republican institutions?'
2. 'Does Congress possess the constitutional power to abolish Slavery and the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia?'
3. 'Is it expedient that Congress should exercise this right, and abolish Slavery and the Slave Trade in the District of Columbia?'
4. 'Are you in favor of an extension of the right of jury trial to all cases involving the question of personal liberty?'
5. 'Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to the United States?'

To the three first inquiries, I reply by referring you to my Annual Message to the Legislature at the commencement of the session of 1836-7, and by stating that none of the opinions therein expressed have been changed.
To the fourth question my reply is, that I am in favor of extending the right of jury trial by jury to all cases involving the question of personal liberty, with the single restriction, that in cases of fugitives from labor in other States, who are admitted to be slaves, it should not be granted. This exception I believe to be due to the sister States in which domestic slavery continually exists, and in which, however we may deplore it as a misfortune, we are bound to respect it as a constitutional institution. This exception is also inevitable from the nature of the issue involved. The question being simply one of slavery, or no slavery, of course whenever the fact is admitted, not only there is no need of further investigation, but it would be vexatious to the claimant to interpose the delay of a jury trial.

On the other hand, in all cases in which a reasonable doubt of the fact of slavery is raised by affidavit, I would be decidedly in favor of having the doubt determined by a jury. Among every man accused of crime, however vile he may be, is presumed to be innocent, 'till convicted by a jury. Shall we be less cautious in the proceedings which are to consign a fellow creature to servitude for life, than in those which will perhaps only send him to idleness for a month in the county jail?

In reply to the 5th question—I am opposed to the admission, by any means, at any time, of Texas, into this Union. The annexed copy of a communication sent to the legislature on the eleventh day of January last (1838), will make known my official opinion on this subject.*

I am, sir, your fellow citizen.
JOSEPH RITNER.
Mr. HENRY HANSEN, Secy.
Care, &c., Pittsburgh, Pa.

*The message referred to contains a very decided expression adverse to the annexation.
SOURCES BY THE TEXAS MINISTER.—We learn from the Kentucky Intelligencer of the 17th inst. that Peter W. Grayson, Esq. of Texas, committed suicide at Bean's Station, a few days before shooting himself with a pistol, through the head. Mr. Grayson was on his way from Texas to Washington City, having received and accepted from the Government of Texas the appointment of Minister Plenipotentiary to the Government of the United States. The act, it is said, was committed with much deliberation. Mr. G. was a native of Kentucky.

From the Friend of Man.

A SINGULAR AFFAIR!
A few Sabbaths ago, ALVAN STEWART, Esq. of this city, by previous invitation and an appointment, delivered a temperance address in August, before the assembled Baptist and Presbyterian congregations of that place, to the mutual edification of the people and their pastors. After the address, a petition to the state legislature against the license law, was signed by a large number of the people assembled. Not long after, he visited Augusta again, to plead the cause of human rights. On this occasion he was arrested by a constable, on a complaint made by himself of his having violated the Sabbath by his temperance labors on the former occasion—and—strange to tell—was actually fined one dollar, by a petty justice, who it seems, knew no better than to do so! In making his defence at the trial, which he did between one and three o'clock in the morning, Mr. Stewart had an opportunity of preaching temperance to a large concourse assembled to enjoy their sure triumph, and who, it is presumed, had seldom, if ever been present at a temperance lecture before. The constable complaint, it is said, did not hear the lecture of which he complained, and if our information be correct, some of the persons concerned in this seemingly zealous vindication of the Sabbath, have not been wont to be distinguished, heretofore, for any unusual regard for its privileges and claims. This incident may serve to remind us that a false zeal for the Sabbath, inconsistent alike with the design of the Sabbath, and with the best interests of man, for whom the Sabbath was made, was not peculiar to the time of the Savior, but may exist even in our own day. How far this instance of ultra sabbatical zeal harmonizes with the complaints of seemingly better men, that the Sabbath and the house of worship are desecrated by appeals for the oppressed poor, and whether the idea of these proceedings was first suggested to these new-fledged reformers, by the criticisms of those who would not wish to be associated with them, we do not pretend to decide. But certainly, the guardianship of the Sabbath is, somehow, getting into new hands, and the very sort of men are trying to enforce the Sabbath laws, who, ten years ago, were ready to cry out against the pioneer stages, and loudly deprecate a union of church and state, if people did not choose to travel on the Sabbath. The times are producing new moral combinations, and we can not guess what will come up next.

Amid all this confusion, the cause of abolition received fresh accessions of strength; and the friends of temperance found good reasons for becoming friends of the slave.

LOOK OUT FOR PERSECUTION.

The enemies of our injured and abused colored citizens have formed a great 'State Colonization Society' in New Jersey, auxiliary to the Slaveholder's Negro Shipping Company, at Washington. The whining hypocrites passed the following, with other resolutions:

Resolved, That the objects of this society shall be to circulate information among the inhabitants of this State, on the subject of Colonization—and to secure for the people of color in New Jersey, if they prefer it, a distinct settlement in Liberia, under the control of the American Colonization Society, and to act in concert with the parent institution, at the city of Washington, in the prosecution of their important and benevolent enterprise.

We are a Jerseyman, and we warrant the whole posse of this inquisition of slavery, that they will need all the apparatus of torture and blood which disgraced Pagan Spain and Portugal in the barbarous, bloody ages, to torture a single worthy and intelligent colored man, from New Jersey, to their African Golgotha.

We know many of the individuals connected with the 'arrogant institution,' and whilst we believe some of them, to be good men, with their eyes filled with dirt by bad men, we believe others to be faithful servants, who delight to do 'their master's bidding.'

One honest, persecuting inquisitor, who has more presumption than brains, already, in a certain neighborhood, has done more mischief and created more prejudice against the poor unoffending colored people, and thrown more difficulties in their way, than his body hung upon pitch-forks could atone for, in purgatory, in a thousand generations. We have been credibly informed, that in soliciting money for his favorite inquisition, he has uniformly, when opposed, urged his suit by saying, 'would you have a negro marry your daughter?'—Contemptible wretch. Is it not enough that colored men are already sought out and abused by every vagabond in the land through colonization instrumentality? Is it not enough that Gurley, and Pinney, Fisk and Bethune, should neglect their appropriate work, to serve Satan in the persecution and slander of our afflicted colored population and their friends? Will this grey-headed totterer, upon the brink of the grave and of eternity, fill up the measure of his iniquity by becoming more notorious for cruelty and wickedness, than Satan himself?

But we forbear. The eye of God is upon these wicked men, and let the EYES of every colored man in the nation, and especially in the state of New Jersey, BE UPON THEM.—The Colored American.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

ONE OF DR. FISK'S CONVERTS.

The Friend of Man contains a letter from J. R. Johnson, a clergyman of Cincinnati, Cortland Co. N. Y. giving in his address to the Anti-Slavery cause. He states that he was a zealous colonizationist—that he read Jay's Inquiry, and thought he judged the scheme too severely; and he had heard Gerrit Smith, at the Broadway Tabernacle, as he thought express himself too strongly against it. 'But,' says he, 'it was on the next evening that I became convinced that Jay and Smith were right in sentiment and right in expression. The place where this conviction was fastened upon my mind was the Middle Dutch church in the city of New York, the occasion, a colonization meeting; the orator who accomplished the work was the Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D. D.' This letter concludes as follows:

'Two years since, I was prepared to advise, after a discourse on slavery, to circulate two contribution boxes, one for abolition funds, and one for colonization; now, I would as soon take up a collection for the express purpose of forging chains and manacles for the slave, as for the colonization cause. These are my feelings towards the scheme itself as it is presented to us; I do not allow myself to impugn the motives of its advocates.'

5. I feel desirous of doing for the cause of abolition whatever is consistent for me to do, as a pastor. I will preach on the subject to my own congregation, and to any neighboring congregation, where I can obtain the express permission of the pastor. I will speak my sentiments through the press—I will attend abolition meetings abroad, so far as I can do so without culpably neglecting my flock. Br. Goodell, if there is any thing more that I can do, please let me know it. Silver and gold have I none.'

6. I enlist in the cause, feeling that we must all waive minor differences of opinion, and with comprehensive views, and generous hearts, strive with our might for the speedy abolition of slavery.

I saw the flames of the 'Pennsylvania Hall'; I saw and heard the roof fall in; I heard many say, 'Good enough for the abolitionists!' My feelings were kindled, and these are the feelings with which I now enlist in the cause of abolition.

A SLAVEHOLDER'S TESTIMONY.—Why don't you go to the south?—See how we are going there!—Hon. Mr. Slade, member of congress, has received a letter from a southern slaveholder, in which he says:

'I have read your speech of 1836 in the Intelligence, in favor of anti-slavery, and take great pleasure in stating that I was highly delighted with its contents. Justice, philanthropy, and religion found in you an eloquent champion. The wretched, degraded, down trodden slave, the poor and helpless African found in you a man able and willing to plead their cause.'

I, sir, was born in the arms and nursed in the bosom of slavery; I have always lived in a slave state, and received my education in the midst of its influence. I know many masters and many slaves. My relatives are all masters. I sustain this relation also. Nevertheless I declare, as far as I am capable of judging, the system of slavery throughout, to master and slave, parents and children, black and white, is full of evil—evil deep, dark, and damning—extending to every ramification of society. In the language of Mr. Clay of Kentucky, 'it is a curse to the master, a grievous wrong to the slave—in the abstract it is all wrong, and no contingency can make it right.'

I have lived long enough in a land of slavery to believe that its moral and social evils can not be exaggerated.—Truth is stranger than fiction.' It is difficult to believe what we know to be true, so great is the enormity and wickedness of the system. What think you of a man's having children by half a dozen of his slaves, despite the tears, entreaties, and remonstrances of his wife; of his being so jealous of a son, in case of a negro, as to drive him from his paternal home; and of having children by his own mulatto daughters—and then to consign children and grand children, by one fell stroke of the pen, to helpless, hopeless, endless bondage? Such an instance occurred in Maryland, and the perpetrator of so many outrages against the laws of God and man, and of so many offences against the decencies of life, was countenanced by the community.

I trust that you will not be deterred from the discharge of your duty by the denunciations of interested advocates, or the slanders and vilifications of a prostituted press, or the revilings and execrations of heartless dealers in human flesh.

I trouble you for the purpose of apprising you that there are some even in slave states, who feel and acknowledge the evils of slavery, and I believe there would be many opposed to it, if they were to examine into the matter.—Discussion and agitation will make all in favor of anti-slavery, who are not swayed by prejudice or education.'

From the Delaware Journal.

GEORGIA IMPUDENCE REBUKED.

A Georgia Sheriff has arrived at the capital of the State of Maine, to demand in the name of the Executive of the State of Georgia, the delivery of a citizen of Maine, as a fugitive from justice, who, it is said, carried off a slave from Georgia, in a vessel. Another account is that the slave got on board of the vessel without the knowledge of the Captain or owner. The slave has been delivered up, and the Georgians now want a free white citizen of the North to make a victim of.

Whatever may be the construction of the constitutional provision on this subject, we say that the institution of slavery is not to be sustained by any such proceeding as this. Let their fugitive slaves be given up, but we never would, let the consequences be what they might, give up a freeman of the north to the tender mercies of Georgia, for such an offence as this. The institution of slavery is one of which no country can be proud. It is one, however, which exists and must be tolerated, but not cherished by the blood of white men.

We are opposed to all intermeddling with it, and would do all we could to restrain and punish such intermeddling on the part of abolitionists and others; but we would punish them at home. It is time that the arrogance of Georgia should receive a check—that state has cost the people of the United States more money, than all the other states in the Union, to purchase out the Indian lands, for its benefit; and by its proceedings towards the Cherokee and Creek, has covered our country with a disgrace and infamy which no lapse of time can obliterate.

We are now forcing 18,000 human beings from their land and habitations, at the point of the bayonet, to gratify the cupidity of Georgia—a deed, which is even now drawing upon us the contempt and abhorrence of the world—a deed which must be placed by the impartial historian, in all time to come on the same page which records the horrors inflicted by Russian tyranny on unhappy Poland!

BRINGING SLAVES TO THE UNITED STATES.

On Saturday a Mr. Lambert Bersin, of Pointe, Gaudouille, was brought up for examination before Justice Lownds, in the U. S. Court, in the absence of Judge Betts, on the charge of having brought with him, from the above place, to the United States, a slave named George Washington, with intent to hold him to labor here, contrary to the laws of the U. S. The case coming to the knowledge of a colored citizen, Mr. Ruggles, who takes an active interest in such matters, he laid the case before the District Attorney, Mr. Price, who caused Mr. Bersin, the claimant of the slave, and Nathaniel Gordon, Captain of the brig Dunlop, of Portland, Me., who, it is said, permitted the slave to be secretly conveyed on board his vessel at Pointe, and arrested forthwith. Judge Lownds after a hearing of the testimony in the case, ordered Mr. Bersin to find bail in \$10,000 for his appearance to answer the charge at the next term of the court, and for the same purpose, Capt. Gordon was held to bail in \$5000.

We understand that week before last, in consequence of information he had received, Mr. Ruggles caused Capt. James Dayton Wilson, formerly of the steamboat Newcastle, to be arrested for selling colored persons as slaves and held to bail in the sum of \$5000. He has charged Capt. W. with having shipped three native citizens of the State of New York, on board of the Newcastle in November last, named Stephen Dickinson, Robert Garrison, and Isaac Wright, and with selling them at New Orleans as slaves.—An acquaintance with him conversed with Ruggles on the subject, thinks that he will be able to sustain the position he has taken in both cases.—N. Y. Sun.

IMMEDIATE ABOLITIONISTS. The Colonial Legislature of Jamaica have framed an act, which has received the sanction of the Governor, and of course become a law, the system of negro apprenticeship shall cease on the first of August next, on which day every negro on that island will receive his freedom. No alarm is manifested, lest the negroes should 'cut their master's throats,' or be too idle, as a body, to earn their livelihood. On the contrary, landed estate on the island has risen 50 and 100 per cent, in many cases higher. This is a strong argument against the utility of slave labor, in favor of emancipation in our own country. We ought to watch the progress of this experiment and profit thereby. People are beginning to talk and act more considerably on this subject, both in the Northern and Southern States. A correspondence has recently been opened between some of the prominent members of Congress and some of the leading abolitionists, from which interchange of thought, the most gratifying results may be expected in reference to this exciting topic. We trust all who take an interest in this matter, will read and talk with care, in that way, correct information will be obtained and disseminated, and a course, would inevitably lead to a proper understanding between the parties at variance, and an earlier and amicable adjustment of the matter in dispute.—Ded. Patriot.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.—The following letter from this distinguished individual was read at the celebration of the first of August in Fall River. QUINCY, 30th July, 1838.

A. Bronson, Esq., Fall River.
Sir,—I have received your kind letter of the 20th inst. inviting me, in behalf of the Fall River Anti-Slavery Society to attend at their anniversary celebration of the first of August. The invitation itself, and the terms in which it is conveyed, are entitled to and receive my warm and grateful acknowledgements. But had it been in my power to attend at any of the meetings for mutual congratulation, on that memorable day, two other invitations to the same, would have deprived me of the gratification of solemnizing it with you. Other considerations, however, have compelled me to withhold my attendance from all public meetings, in which I may be expected to take an active part. An infirm state of health, and an enfeebled and broken voice have imposed on me the necessity of prescribing to myself this self-denial of inclination.

But though absent from you in body I shall be present with you in Spirit—in Faith—in Hope—in Charity. In Faith that the National Emancipation of British Slaves has been and will prove a giant stride towards the extinction of Slavery throughout the Earth. In hope that this extinction of Slavery will prepare the way for the kingdom of the Redeemer, when

'All crimes shall cease, and ancient fraud shall fall;
Retaining justice left aloft her scale;
Peace o'er the world her olive wand extend,
And white ro'd innocence from Heaven descend.'

In charity with all mankind—hearing no malice or ill-will to any human being, and even compassionating those who hold in bondage their fellow-men—not knowing what they do.

With these sentiments I remain respectfully your friend and fellow-citizen.

J. Q. ADAMS.

HOW TO SAVE MONEY FOR THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

—If every town anti-slavery Society would appoint an efficient committee in each school district, whose duty it shall be to solicit subscriptions on the permanent quarterly plan from every abolitionist in the district, and collect and forward the money promptly, at the expiration of each quarter to the town treasurer of the State, county, or town Society; and also to establish a circulating anti-slavery library; and in cases where there is no town Society, if the friends would volunteer and do the work above specified, in their respective districts, the cause would not languish for want of funds; and the salaries of a large number of agents who must otherwise be appointed to do this work, would be saved.

Reader, you may save \$100 or more per annum for the benefit of the suffering millions of your brethren and sisters in bondage, by taking hold of this work with energy and perseverance in your own town or district. Will you do it? If not, are you remembering those in bonds as bound with them?—Friend of Man.

ANTI-SLAVERY LIBRARIES.—What one man can do.

—An agent of the N. Y. State A. S. Society writes to the following effect. In a certain neighborhood, it was proposed to establish an Anti-Slavery Library. Only one individual was found disposed to make any contribution to the object.—This man at length concluded to order the Library, on his own responsibility. In less than six weeks he had the pleasure of finding that twenty six of his substantial friends and neighbors had become thorough and intelligent abolitionists through the instrumentality of the books he had procured.

Suppose, now, every one of these 26 new converts should be equally successful in their efforts, and so on. What a harvest would ultimately be gathered from a single seed!—B.

MARTIN VAN BUREN AND HENRY CLAY.

—The Mobile Com. Register says:—It is too late in the day for hypocritical regrets that 'one is obliged to say that Mr. Van Buren is an abolitionist.' The South have heard and judged him on this subject, and his seat in the Presidential Chair is the evidence of the confidence the Southern people repose in him.

The same paper of the 15th ult. says:—'We would do by Mr. Clay as the South have done by Mr. Van Buren—leave him not an inch of neutral ground to stand upon, between the South and Fanatics. We must push him as far as Mr. Van Buren was pushed—the South saw that Mr. Van Buren was pushed—the South saw that Mr. Clay's resolutions' It is in vain to talk of Mr. Clay's resolutions' It is one step—the first step. He must occupy the whole length; and walk altogether off of the middle neutral ground, which he occupies, or the South will spurn and reject him.'—Freeman.

From the Emancipator.

ANTI-SLAVERY ALMANAC FOR 1839. is now in the hands of the stereotypers, and will be issued in a few weeks, by the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It will be printed on good paper, and neatly trimmed, with a cover.

While Temperance, and other almanacs, are issued by the million, less than 100,000 Anti-Slavery Almanacs have heretofore been sold yearly. The forthcoming number will contain a mass of facts, arguments, and answers to objections, calculated for all meridians, where minds are to be converted, and enlisted in the cause of slaves.

Two editions are published, with calculations for New York and Boston, which will adapt it to all the northern parts of the Union. Reader, we look to you, to see that enough are ordered forthwith, for the supply of every family in your town. One abolitionist in Connecticut proposes to supply every family in the county where he lives, not by giving them away, but by having them sold from house to house, by abolitionists in the several towns. The profits on those which are sold, will supply families who refuse to buy. In this way, a little time and labor may do more good than many hundred dollars expended in any other way. BEGIN EARLY.

ALTON.

Mr. HOBHOUSE, editor of the Dedham Patriot, who is now on a journey at the west, writes from this place, under date of June 4, as follows:

The question of abolitionism is yet a volcano and an earthquake to the city. The rumblings of the internal fires are often heard. Suspicion and jealousy stand ready to kindle the flames at a moment's warning. The first spark, or stranger does, on arriving in Alton, is to seek out the scene of the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy's disasters. By accident, I happen to board in a family with a brother of that unfortunate man, and with some of his most intimate friends and supporters. The story of his opposition to slavery, and of his melancholy death, has been a constant theme of conversation in the family. One of the gentlemen above mentioned, has shown me the building where the Observer was printed, and described all the proceedings of the mob, on what Mr. Lovejoy fell. A part of the ill-fated press now lies upon the landing, near the office, half covered with rust and mud. Some persons from Philadelphia, I am informed, recently carried a piece of it to the east, in a glass case, as a sacred relic. They should preserve the relic of the martyr, with a charred rib from the skeleton of the mulatto burnt at St. Louis, a brand from the Cheltenham convent, and a handful of ashes from the ruins of Pennsylvania Hall.

One hundred and fifty Cherokees passed through Decatur, Alabama, a few days ago, on their way to Arkansas. The Decatur Observer says:—'While we saw some drunk, and others playing cards—one man, a colored woman, we saw some in a log reaching the acts of the Apostles in Cheltenham, with an air of reverential solemnity, seldom witnessed.'

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

IVES & JEWETT. Dr. BRADNORTH'S Agents for the sale of his justly Celebrated Vegetable Catarrh Pills, for Essey County, have appointed Agents, General Pills, leaving Town, of whom the Genuine Medicine may be had with certainty be obtained.

Hazenhill—T. G. Farnsworth, P. M.
Beverly—Samuel P. Lovett
Marblehead—Thomas Nicholson
Essex—George W. Burnham
Dorchester—Wm. M. A. Kerton & Co.
Dorchester S. Parish—H. Martin
Dorchester S. Parish—Samuel Tweed
Dorchester Plains—Daniel Richards
Middleton—Daniel Everett
Andover S. Parish—Wm. Barton
Andover S. Parish—Enoch Stevens
East Bradford—Benj. Parker
East Bradford & Bradford—Geo. Spafford & Co.
Saugus—George Newhall, P. M.
Lynn—James R. Newhall
Manchester—A. H. Trask & Co.
Gloucester—Charles Smith, 3d
Topsham—Nathaniel Parley
Essex, N. Parish—E. L. W. W. W.
Jewettbury & Salisbury—E. Porter
Jewettbury—Charles Whipple
Boston—O. Blackinton
Jewettbury—Samuel N. Baker
Hamilton—F. Dane
Newham—David Stetson
Lynn, Swampscott—L. W. R. Miller
Weymouth—Wm. H. Chapman
Methuen Falls—S. I. Varny
Salisbury—B. E. Fildes
Dorchester Shillash Plains—Mr. Walton
Purchasers of Dr. Bradnorth's Pills, shew that four things

1st. Never purchase of any individual in East County but of the above, for they are the only persons authorized by Dr. B. as vendors of the Genuine Medicine.
2d. Druggists are never appointed Agents by Dr. B. Ask to see the Copper Plate Certificate of Agency—Every Agent has one.
3d. THOUSANDS speak in unequalled terms of the production of the GENUINE PILLS, whereas the counterfeits have generally been detected by their injurious effects.
4th. WESLEY JEWETT, Boston, No. 193 Essex St., Salem.
Dr. Bradnorth's General Agents for Essex Co. are March 12.

DR. THOMAS BARNES.

SURGEON DENTIST, 33 HOWARD STREET, BOSTON.

Having received the premium at the late Fair in New York for the best whole set of Mineral and other Artificial Teeth, and in Dental Surgery for inserting Natural or Porcelain Teeth, from one to a whole set. To fail and have obtained for the past three years the only set in New York Institute, and the Teeth are better in color and more perfect in shape than any other set in the country, especially those made in Boston, and are made at the price of \$10 or \$20 apiece.
Dr. Barnes has practiced Dentistry in this city for twenty